

Amendment
Serial No.09/944,300

Docket No.DE000133

REMARKS

Entry of this Amendment and reconsideration are respectfully requested in view of the amendments

Claims 1-4 are pending and stand rejected. Claims 1 and 4 have been amended.

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Strong (USP no. 5,384,892).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with, and explicitly traverses, the examiner's rejection of the claims. However, in the interest of advancing the prosecution of the instant application, independent claims 1 and 4 have been amended to more clearly state the invention. More specifically, applicant has amended claims 1 and 4 to state that "selected ones of the plurality of speech models being provided with information (9) specifically related to the corresponding speech model." No new matter has been added.

Support for the amendment may be found on at least page 5, lines 10-15, which state, in part, "[f]urthermore, the speech dialogue system includes a plurality of databases DB-1, DB-2, . . . , DB-M, in which theme-specific information is stored. The theme-specific speech models and the theme-specific databases correspond to each other in line with the respective themes."

Strong, as read by applicant, discloses a system and method for speech recognition which determines acoustic features, recognizes words based on a language model and the selection of an appropriate response based on the words recognized. Strong discloses that a vocabulary used is generated by the language model generator from a larger vocabulary so that the "[r]ecognizer will . . . search only in the portion of the database (vocabulary) according the language model information." (see col. 4, lines 65-68). Strong further discloses that the language model generator "determines based on the current operating conditions . . . sequences of words which are expected to be received by recognizer 220 in order to limit the scope of the vocabulary search." (see col. 5, lines 10-15). This dynamic operation of the language model generating a limited vocabulary is shown in Fig. 3, wherein the language model is generated between time t_1 and t_2 for buffered features received from the feature extraction process. (see col. 6, lines 48-53).

Docket No. DE000133

Amendment
Serial No.09/944,300

It is well recognized that to constitute a rejection pursuant to 35 USC §102, i.e., anticipation, all material elements recited in a claim must be found in one unit of prior art. Strong, accordingly, cannot be said to anticipate the invention recited in independent claim 1 because Strong fails to disclose all the elements claimed. More specifically, Strong fails to disclose "selected ones of the plurality of speech models being provided with information (9) specifically related to the corresponding speech model", as is recited in amended claim 1. Rather Strong teaches language models that are word specific (LM1-LM3, in Figures 4-6), a combination language model (LM4, in Figure 7), or a command responsive language model (LM6, Figures 10-12). However, Strong fails to disclose the models having access to information specifically related to a corresponding speech model.

Having shown that Strong fails to disclose all the elements claimed, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claim.

With regard to claims 2 and 3, these claims ultimately depend from independent claim 1, which has been shown to be allowable over the cited reference. Accordingly, claims 2 and 3 are also allowable by virtue of their dependence from an allowable base claim.

With regard to claim 4, this claim recites subject matter similar to that recited in claim 1 and has been amended in a manner similar to that made to claim 1. Hence, for the amendments made to the claim and for the remarks made with regard to claim 1, which are reasserted, as if in full, herein, applicant submits that claim 4 is not anticipated by Strong.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claim.

In reply to the statements made in Response to [Applicant's] Arguments, on pages 3 and 4 of the instant Office Action, with regard to col. 10, lines 9-22, applicant submits that Strong teaches adding entries responsive to a command language model, i.e., an Open command. However, the addition of a new entry in a language model fails to teach the claimed limitation "the word sub-sequence is evaluated by each of a plurality of different speech models (8)."

Docket No. DE000133


Amendment
Serial No. 09/944,300

Accordingly, notwithstanding the amendments made to the claims herein, applicant submits that contrary to the reason for rejecting the claims, Strong cannot be said to anticipate the invention claimed because Strong fails to disclose each of the elements claimed.

For all the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all the present claims are patentable in view of the cited references. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

John Vodopia
Registration No. 36,299


By: Steve Chá
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 44,069

Date: November 3, 2005

Mail all correspondence to:
John Vodopia, Registration No. 36,299
US PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001
Phone: (914) 333-9624
Fax: (914) 332-0615